Fallowfield
Manor Close
Manor Road
Penn nr. High Wycombe
Buckinghamshire

Dr. Michael Redhead
Chelsea College
Department of History
and Philosophy of Science
Manresa Road
London SW3

28th June 1983

Dear Michael,

Many thanks for your kind Collins dated 22nd June 1983. I enclose a list of publications for the last year.

It was very kind of you to come with Professor Allen Franklin.

I did not ask you whether you have got the Chair yet. Of course, I am very interested.

I understand that you uphold your objection to my version of the EPR experiment. I am not quite sure, however, about one point: is it, or is it not, an objection to the original EPR experiment or only to my version? (I understand that yours is not an objection to David Bohm's version.) Please let me know.

There is a problem or two about the Popper-Miller paper.

(1) I saw that you had a slight objection to a formulation of mine which I hardly could agree to be of importance, and which I could at most say to be slightly improvable. I could not even identify the objectionable passage with anything like certainty after you left! But I am now sure that it is the phrase at the left side of the second page (p. 688) "that factor that contains all of h that does not follow deductively from e", and its near-repetition on the right side "that part of the hypothesis that is not deductively entailed by the evidence ...". If these are the passages, I wish to withdraw my agreement with your view that these passages are objectionable even in the slightest degree. For (a) they become both perfectly all right if, in the first phrase, after the word "contains", we add "(in the presence of e)"; (b) but this is as clearly implied as can be, since (c) "in the presence of e" is explicitly stated 5 lines before Theorem 1, and (d) it is clearly implied in the first phrase to which you object.

So if these are the phrases to which you object, I simply think you are mistaken, since "contains (in the presence of e) all of h that does not follow from e" is logically a perfect characterisation of the first factor and of its content.

(2) I should like to know whether you regard your objection as invalidating our paper in any way whatever. I did not understand that this was your position when you were here.

/Continued

Dr. Michael Redhead, Chelsea College

I am interested in this question for the following reason: I have been told that the L.S.E. department has heard from Professor Franklin that you have some serious objection to the Popper-Miller paper. I certainly got the opposite impression when you and Franklin were here - but of course, I may have been misled by the gentleness with which you tried to convey your objection! Since, when you were here, I agreed with what you said (taking it for no more than a stylistic point), I wish now to make quite clear that I certainly did not intend to agree with anything that could be described as an objection: I regard the paper as perfectly in order, although, of course, far from perfect. If it is reprinted, I should suggest a few stylistic improvements, including the repetition in parentheses of "(in the presence of e)".

I should be glad if you could show this letter to Allen Franklin.

Yours sincerely,

Melitta Hess

p.p. Karl Popper

Enc.